

**COMMUNITY DIALOG  
ON  
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE**

**Meeting Summary of May 14<sup>th</sup>, 2003**

The “exciting conclusion” to the Community Dialog series began early, at 6:30 PM. Participants fortified themselves for a longer than usual evening with a buffet of pizza and egg rolls. Supervisor Bulova began the meeting with a brief discussion of the attendance record for participants and voting status. She mentioned that several amendments had been made to the attendance records that had been previously e-mailed to the group. Everyone present at the May 14<sup>th</sup> meeting had attended the five meetings or more to qualify as a “voting participant”. Supervisor Bulova said that this last meeting would no doubt last beyond the usual 9 PM adjournment time so that final recommendations could be adopted.

Each of the Community Dialog Sub-Groups next reported out on their recommendations and work that they had done since the April 30<sup>th</sup> meeting to make their format and language compatible for a unified slate of recommendations.

At the suggestion of Bob Kelly, Sharon said she would request each of the Sub-Groups to choose their four highest priorities among their recommendations. She suggested that the entire Community Dialog Group could then make suggestions for items on the longer list they would substitute, or add to the priority list. She said that Roberts Rules of Order would be used to vote the priority slate, then amendments and substitutes to it, up or down. Jan Hedetniemi volunteered to record recommendations on flip charts sheets that she taped on the walls.

Jeff Stoll went first, listing the top four priorities for the Transportation and Land Use Planning Group (See detailed language in attached Recommendation Report). A motion by Tom Meany to include as a priority the need to increase capacity and build new roads and bridges, especially in a north/south direction passed with 20 people voting “aye” and 6 “nay”. After further discussion, including a motion (later withdrawn) by Bob Griendling to have the group vote up-front on the need for more/new taxes for transportation, and a suggestion (accepted by the group) by Nell Hurley to streamline the recommendations, the final slate passed unanimously:

**LAND USE & TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GROUP**

- 1. Improve Planning Process for Both Transportation and Land Use. Sponsor regional community planning sessions/charettes. Incorporate into planning the coordination and connection of Metro and VRE to local**

**bus service, subscription bus and neighborhood shuttle bus service, as well as trails and sidewalks.**

- 2. Place Higher Priority on (educate the public/promote more vigorously) Mass Transit (i.e. Metro, VRE, Bus, HOV, Ride Sharing, Slug Lines).**
- 3. Increase road capacity and build road and bridge connections, especially in north/south direction.**
- 4. Utilize Mixed Use Development, providing flexibility among zoning categories, for more walkable and transit-friendly communities.**

George Barker presented the Funding Group's priorities. He stressed that they were already in PRIORITY order and were to be pursued SEQUENTIALLY. Considerable discussion ensued on recommendation number 3 which calls for an "increase in the percentage of County general funds used for transportation, including the possibility of new County transportation bonds". The argument was made that this would be letting the State off the hook for something that is their responsibility and paying for it out of money that should instead be used for schools, libraries, parks, etc. The counter point was made that we have a transportation crisis. Another member commented that no one is complaining about our lack of libraries and park facilities. Several members felt that we should stop doing referendums for those non critical items and invest instead in the road and mass transportation needs. Jeff Nolan moved to drop recommendation number 3 from the list. After further discussion, the vote on the amendment failed by a vote of 22 "nays" and 8 "ayes". The Funding Group's final slate of recommendations passed 29 to 1 as follows:

#### **FUNDING GROUP**

**(Recommendations are in priority order and should be pursued sequentially)**

- 1. Develop an Annual County Transportation Progress Report.**
- 2. Maximize, to extent practical, mechanisms that do not involve use of tax monies from the general public (e.g. proffers, special tax districts, toll roads and private road construction).**
- 3. Increase the percentage of County general funds used for transportation, including the possibility of new County transportation bonds.**

4. **Have effects on air quality be an explicit factor in transportation funding decisions.**
5. **Seek the same taxing authority cities have (such as cigarette, hotel, and restaurant taxes) to provide options for increasing funds for needs such as transportation without having to increase the property tax rate.**
6. **After other recommendations have been pursued, support increasing taxes for transportation in the following priority order, with the proviso that any regional tax should have a firewall that prevents the State from diverting money raised locally to the State general fund and prevents the State from substituting the new funding for funding we already receive:**
  - a. **An increase in the sales tax;**
  - b. **An increase in the gas tax, to be considered at both the State and regional levels.**
  - c. **Increasing taxes or fees on trucks or truck traffic.**

Chris Craig presented the top recommendations of the Legislative Sub Group. A motion was made by Bob Kelly and seconded by Mike Malak to include in the slate a recommendation that the County “seek and adopt legislation to increase the gasoline tax and dedicate those revenues to transportation”. The group questioned whether this conflicted with the Funding Group’s recommendation that other strategies be pursued before seeking new or additional taxes. Members of the Funding Group responded that they would be supportive of this particular funding source and that they would advocate recommending that a regional increase in the gasoline tax for transportation should be a top priority and **should not be deferred** until other measures were exhausted. A vote in favor of adding this to the list was unanimous.

A good deal of discussion took place over the issue of cash proffers and impact fees for schools and other County responsibilities. While some concern was expressed about the effect this might have on the cost of housing, and the need to remain within our legal parameters, the group favored this recommendation. A motion was advanced by Ivan Dietrich and seconded by Tom Meany to adopt the entire slate, with the inclusion of the gasoline tax. Mark Werfel moved to amend the list by removing the recommendation about HOT Lanes. The motion died for a lack of a second. The vote on the entire Legislative Group’s slate (as follows) passed with one “nay” vote.

#### **LEGISLATIVE GROUP**

- 1. Seek and adopt legislation to give greater taxing and spending authority *and responsibility* to local elected officials.**
- 2. Seek and adopt legislation to increase gasoline tax and dedicate revenues to transportation.**
- 3. Enact Zoning Ordinance Standards that better support infrastructure and require developers to fund adequate roads, schools, libraries, public works facilities and green space.**
  - a. Strengthen current proffer system/ implement impact fees.**
  - b. Enact Comprehensive Plan changes that "down-plan" areas of Fairfax that do not have - and will not likely have in the next decade - the capacity to accommodate needed roads and other facilities. This should be done in conjunction with "up-planning" for higher density around metro areas.**
- 4. Seek more local control over land use.**

Sharon briefly went through the complete list of recommendations submitted by the Sub-Groups to make sure the full Community Dialog Group was comfortable with including those lists in the final report, and the extended recommendation list. Under the Legislative Group "Local Recommendations" the group discussed recommendation #1 which read "Enact a program where by VRE and all "non Metro" transit (including local bus and shuttle bus services) are merged and/or coordinated to reduce administrative costs and free up money for development of the systems." After some discussion, it was agreed that "merged" should be removed from the sentence as the intent was to encourage coordination, and not to create a large single transportation bureaucracy.

With discussion and voting complete, Sharon thanked members of the Community Dialog for their faithful participation and hard work. She said that a final report of the Community Dialog would be presented to the Board of Supervisors, as well as other regional organizations. She also said that members of the group should stay tuned for the Braddock District Town Meeting on June 25<sup>th</sup>, 7:30 PM at the Kings Park Library Meeting Room. She indicated that she would contact participants about playing a role in presenting the Community Dialog effort and resulting recommendations to the Braddock District community.

Sharon Bulova

Attendance:

Chair: Sharon Bulova  
Braddock District Staff:

Florence Naeve  
Sally Tomlin  
Colin Campbell  
Ronni McCrohan  
Miranda Hutten

**Ms. Nancy Baltrusch  
Mr. George Barker  
Mr. James Buratti  
Ms. Bernice Colvard  
Mr. Christopher Craig  
Mrs. Dorothy Dane  
Mr. Dan Desko  
Mr. Ivan Dietrich  
Mr. Mervin Dizenfeld  
Mr. Robert Griendling  
Ms. Suzanne Harsel  
Ms. Jan Hedetniemi  
Ms. Nell Hurley  
Mr. Robert Kelly  
Mr. Paul Kite  
Mr. Michael Malak  
Ms. Phyliss McDevitt  
Mr. Tom Meany  
Mr. John Miranda  
Mr. Jeffery Nolan  
Ms. Barbara Nunes  
Mr. Thomas Reinkober  
Ms. Judy Rexrode  
Mr. Mike Salmon  
Mr. Peter Skoro  
Mr. Harry Stevenson  
Mr. Jeff Stoll  
Mr. Ben Tribbett  
Ms. Terry Wanbaugh  
Mr. Mark Werfel  
Ms. Barbara Williams**